

## **REMARKS**

### **Objections to the Specification**

The disclosure is objected to because sequence identifiers are absent after all amino acid sequences within the specification, specifically at page 6 and 8. Applicants have amended page 6 of the specification to include the appropriate SEQ ID NOs. The Office Action also objects to amino acid sequences disclosed on page 8 of the specification for not having sequence identifiers. See Office Action at page 3, lines 14-17. The sequences found on page 8 do not require sequence identifiers because they are branched amino acid sequences. 37 CFR 1.821 (a) specifically states that branched amino acid sequences are excluded from the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 (d).

The disclosure is also objected to because the specification lacks the heading “Brief Description of the Drawings.” Applicants have amended the specification to include the appropriate heading.

No new matter is added.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 11-13 are amended to recite that the functional molecule is attached to the hub via a second flexible linker. These amendments place the claims in a more preferred form.

Claims 37 and 38 are newly added. These claims recite limitations present within

claim 1 and are discussed below.

The remaining amendments to claim 1 are addressed below in connection with the rejection they address.

Claims 2-8, 14-32, and 36 are canceled. No new matter is added.

Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Office Action asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite specific structural limitations specifically taught within the specification.

Amended claim 1 recites that the hub is a lysine residue shown at position 17 of SEQ ID NO:3 or a glutamic acid residue shown at position 1 of SEQ ID NO:5. The specification supports these amendments on page 3, line 32: “In a preferred embodiment, the hub is lysine” and on page 4, line 5: “In a further preferred embodiment the hub is glutamic acid.”

Amended claim 1 also recites wherein each peptide monomer unit consists of the amino acids shown at positions 1 – 13 of SEQ ID NO:3 or the amino acids shown at positions 5-18 of SEQ ID NO:5. The specification supports these amendments by teaching “a peptide monomer unit as used herein refers to a peptide that can interact with

a sub-unit of a self-assembling peptide.” Page 4, lines 18-19. Figure 1 shows that positions 1-13 of SEQ ID NO:3 (shown as block C) and positions 5-18 of SEQ ID NO:5 (shown as block D) interact with segments B and A, respectively, of self-assembling peptide SAF-p1. The specification teaches that “[b]lock A complements D and B complements C. This leads to sticky-ended dimers that assemble further into fibres.” Page 11, lines 5-6.

Claim 1 is also amended to recite a first flexible linker consisting of three poly- $\beta$ -alanine residues. The specification supports this amendment on page 4, lines 13-14: “It is particularly preferred that the flexible linker is a poly- $\beta$ -alanine peptide comprising between 2 and 10 residues, more preferably about 3 to 5 residues.”

The specification supports each amendment to claim 1. Thus, the skilled artisan would most certainly recognize that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention, as recited by amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

By:     /Sarah A. Kagan/    

Sarah A. Kagan  
Registration No. 32,141

Date: August   2  , 2007

Banner & Witcoff  
Customer No: 22907

